UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,958	07/13/2006	Dizhong Chen	14090-00003-US1	7522
	7590 05/26/201 SOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STR		STOCKTON, LAURA LYNNE		
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substa of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
All Participants: (1) Laura L. Stockton (USPTO). (2) Mark J. Pino (Reg. No. 43.858). (4) Date of Interview: 17 May 2010 Time: 12:52pm Type of Interview: Time: 1	Evaminar-Initiated Interview Summary	10/572,958	CHEN ET AL.			
All Participants: (1) Laura L. Stockton (USPTO): (2) Mark J. Pino (Reg. No. 43.858): (4)	Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
(1) Laura L. Stockton (USPTO): (3)		Laura L. Stockton	1626			
(2) Mark J. Pino (Reg. No. 43,858). (4) Date of Interview: 17 May 2010 Time: 12:52pm Type of Interview:	All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>98</u>				
Date of Interview: 17 May 2010	(1) Laura L. Stockton {USPTO}.	(3)				
Type of Interview: Telephonic Telephonic	(2) Mark J. Pino {Reg. No. 43,858}.	(4)				
Telephonic Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I.	Date of Interview: <u>17 May 2010</u>	Time: <u>12:52pm</u>				
Part II. Substance of printer rush. In the Examiner scale (95.15pm of same day and left a voice mail message informing Applicant's representative that the application had been returned to the Examiner because of a printer rush. The Examiner's call (95.15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner printer rush and suggested an arenue to cornect the printer rush. The Examiner's call (95.15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner permission to change lines 34-35 page 20 of the specification by Examiner's Amendment with language proposed by Mr. Pino. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the intervidirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the intervidirectly resulted in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the intervidirectly resulted in the Notice of Allowability.	 ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No 	nt's representative)				
Rejection(s) discussed: Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed: Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Examiner called the Office of Applicant's representative on Monday, May 17, 2010 @12:52pm and left a voice mail messag informing Applicant's representative that the application had been returned to the Examiner because of a printer rush. The Examiner indicated the reason for the printer rush and suggested an avenue to correct the printer rush. Mr. Mark J. Pino return the Examiner's call @6:15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner permission to change lines 34-35 page 20 of the specification by Examiner's Amendment with language proposed by Mr. Pino. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	If Yes, provide a brief description:					
Prior art documents discussed: Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Examiner called the Office of Applicant's representative on Monday, May 17, 2010 @12:52pm and left a voice mail messag informing Applicant's representative that the application had been returned to the Examiner because of a printer rush. The Examiner indicated the reason for the printer rush and suggested an avenue to correct the printer rush. Mir. Mark J. Pino return the Examiner's call @5:15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner permission to change lines 34-35 page 20 of the specification by Examiner's Amendment with language proposed by Mir. Pino. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Part I.					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Examiner called the Office of Applicant's representative on Monday, May 17, 2010 @12:52pm and left a voice mail messag informing Applicant's representative that the application had been returned to the Examiner because of a printer rush. The Examiner indicated the reason for the printer rush and suggested an avenue to correct the printer rush. Mr. Mark J. Pino return the Examiner's call @5:15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner permission to change lines 34-35 page 20 of the specification by Examiner's Amendment with language proposed by Mr. Pino. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Rejection(s) discussed:					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Examiner called the Office of Applicant's representative on Monday, May 17, 2010 @12:52pm and left a voice mail message informing Applicant's representative that the application had been returned to the Examiner because of a printer rush. The Examiner indicated the reason for the printer rush and suggested an avenue to correct the printer rush. Mir. Mark J. Pino return the Examiner's call @5:15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner permission to change lines 34-35 page 20 of the specification by Examiner's Amendment with language proposed by Mir. Pino. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Claims discussed:					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Examiner called the Office of Applicant's representative on Monday, May 17, 2010 @12:52pm and left a voice mail message informing Applicant's representative that the application had been returned to the Examiner because of a printer rush. The Examiner indicated the reason for the printer rush and suggested an avenue to correct the printer rush. Mr. Mark J. Pino return the Examiner's call @5:15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner permission to change lines 34-35 page 20 of the specification by Examiner's Amendment with language proposed by Mr. Pino. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Prior art documents discussed:					
The Examiner called the Office of Applicant's representative on Monday, May 17, 2010 @12:52pm and left a voice mail message informing Applicant's representative that the application had been returned to the Examiner because of a printer rush. The Examiner indicated the reason for the printer rush and suggested an avenue to correct the printer rush. Mr. Mark J. Pino return the Examiner's call @5:15pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner permission to change lines 34-35 page 20 of the specification by Examiner's Amendment with language proposed by Mr. Pino. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interviectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Part II.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interviectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substate of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the intervied did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 	The Examiner called the Office of Applicant's representative on Mainforming Applicant's representative that the application had been Examiner indicated the reason for the printer rush and suggested the Examiner's call @5:15pm of same day and left a voice mail in	Monday, May 17, 2010 @12:52pm or returned to the Examiner becaus I an avenue to correct the printer of the sage giving the Examiner perm	n and left a voice mail message se of a printer rush. The rush. Mr. Mark J. Pino returned			
directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substa of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the intervided not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Part III.					
/Laura L. Stockton/	☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview					
/Laura L. Stockton/						
	/Laura L. Stockton/					
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate	(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			